

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 21, 2008. Claims 6, 8–10, 16, and 18–20 were pending. By this amendment, claims 6 and 16 are amended to cover broader subject matter, and new claims 25–26 are presented. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

It is noted that all differences between the cited reference(s) and each claim may not necessarily be recited herein. This is not an admission on the part of the Applicant that Applicant concurs with the Examiner's assertions regarding the patentability of said claims over the cited reference(s). Applicant, in some cases, may simply choose to highlight particular differences between the claims and the reference(s). Such differences may render any differences not explicitly addressed moot.

1. Rejection of Independent Claim 6 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,460,015 to Hetherington et al. (hereinafter “**Hetherington**”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,432,948 to Davis et al. (hereinafter “**Davis**”) in further view of U.S. Patent 5,490,061 to Tolin et al. (hereinafter “**Tolin**”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hetherington discloses a system of saving text entered in the Latin character set and saving a transliterated representation of the entered text using a character–mapping resource file table specific to the language in which the text was entered (said language using the Latin character set), to allow the

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

second transliterated text to be properly pronounced by a speaker unfamiliar with the first language (nonspeakers). See Hetherington, Abstract.

Davis discloses the use of transliteration to phonetically convert individual character sequences in a first language into character sequences of a second language through the use of a set of ordered rules describing the character to be transliterated and characters following this character. See Davis, Abstract and columns 5–6.

Tolin discloses a process of repeatedly stripping a word of suffixes, and comparing the stripped word with a morpheme root database to provide a **translation** of the word. See Tolin, Abstract.

Independent Claim 6 recites a computer implemented method for transliterating languages in a computing device comprising (1) “*receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device*”, (2) “*converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet*”, (3) “*converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet*”, and (4) “*transliterating the text string*”.

The Office Action admits that “Hetherington does not disclose converting a test string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet, and converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet.” Office Action, page 3.

To remedy this deficiency, the Office action introduces Tolin, asserting that “Tolin discloses mapping an input string from one language to a string in another language using an intermediary language (Column 2 line 59 – column 3 line 11 and Figures 1 and 3). The method disclosed in Tolin is used for **machine translation**; however translation and transliteration methods are within the same field of endeavor and are regularly used together **for translation purposes.**” Office Action, pages 3–4. Emphasis added.

The Office Action admits that Tolin is directed towards machine **translation**. While the Office Action asserted, without support, that the translation and transliteration are within the same field of endeavor and regularly used together **for translation purposes**, the Office action has failed to suggest that translation and transliteration are regularly used together **for transliteration purposes**.

Applicant respectfully notes that claim 6 **does not include translation** as a cited feature. Therefore, the Office action has failed to provide proper reasoning for inclusion of Tolin for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue, which is **transliteration**. Tolin is therefore **nonanalogous art**, which may not be properly applied to the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Furthermore, even assuming arguendo that the Office Action intended either to provide **Official Notice** of transliteration and translation being in the

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

same field or to assert the same was **common knowledge**, Applicant respectfully traverses these **non-presented assertions** for at least the following reasons.

Translation is typically performed using databases of word meaning (see Tolin) on words entered by a user. In addition, there is often no correlation between the pronunciation of a given word in one language and its pronunciation in a second language. For translation to occur, the user must enter a word in a **first language**, and have it converted into a **word of similar meaning in a second language**.

In contrast, transliteration is based on the sound(s) that a character or set of characters make. As disclosed in Claim 6, a text string received in a first language is converted to a phonetic string, and then converted into a second language based on that phonetic string. **Translation is not recited.**

Because the deficiency of Hetherington is not cured by Davis (alone or in combination), the properly applied references fail to teach or suggest each of the elements of amended claim 6. Accordingly, Claim 6 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection of Claim 6 should be withdrawn.

Claims 8–10 depend from Claim 6, and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

2. Rejection of Independent Claim 16 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hetherington** in view of **Davis** in further view of **Tolin**. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

Independent Claim 16 recites a computer readable storage medium having computer executable instructions stored thereon that when executed cause a computing device to perform a method for transliterating languages in the computing device comprising (1) *“receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device”*, (2) *“converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet”*, (3) *“converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet”*, and (4) *“transliterating the text string”*.

The Office Action admits that “Hetherington does not disclose converting a test string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet, and converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet.” Office Action, page 3.

To remedy this deficiency, the Office action introduces Tolin, asserting that “Tolin discloses mapping an input string from one language to a string in another language using an intermediary language (Column 2 line 59 – column 3 line 11 and Figures 1 and 3). The method disclosed in Tolin is used for machine translation; however translation and transliteration methods are within the same

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

field of endeavor and are regularly used together **for translation purposes.**”

Office Action, pages 3–4. Emphasis added.

The Office Action admits that Tolin is directed towards machine **translation**. While the Office Action asserted, without support, that the translation and transliteration are within the same field of endeavor and regularly used together **for translation purposes**, the Office action has failed to suggest that translation and transliteration are regularly used together **for transliteration purposes**.

Applicant respectfully notes that claim 16 **does not include translation** as a cited feature. Therefore, the Office action has failed to provide proper reasoning for inclusion of Tolin for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue, which is **transliteration**. Tolin is therefore **nonanalogous art**, which may not be properly applied to the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Furthermore, even assuming arguendo that the Office Action intended either to provide **Official Notice** of transliteration and translation being in the same field or to assert the same was **common knowledge**, Applicant respectfully traverses these **non-presented assertions** for at least the following reasons.

Translation is typically performed using databases of word meaning (see Tolin) on words entered by a user. In addition, there is often no correlation between the pronunciation of a given word in one language and its pronunciation in a second language. For translation to occur, the user must enter a word in a **first language**, and have it converted into a **word in a second language**.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

In contrast, transliteration is based on the sound(s) that a character or set of characters make. As disclosed in Claim 16, a text string received in a first language is converted to a phonetic string, and then converted into a second language based on that phonetic string. **Translation is not recited.**

Because the deficiency of Hetherington is not cured by Davis (alone or in combination), the references fail to teach or suggest each of the elements of amended claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn.

Claims 18–20 depend from claim 16, and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

3. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: February 20, 2009

By: /Henry Gabryjelski/

Henry Gabryjelski, Reg. No.: 62,828
Direct telephone 425-703-8116
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

February 20, 2009
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Signature

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01
Application Filing Date: Dec 30, 2003